REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-16. Pending in the case are claims 1-16, which remain as originally entered.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 37, and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kreuter et al. (U.S. 5,592,906) in view of Yoshioka (U.S. 5,713,317).

The Examiner asserts that Yoshioka teaches that it is conventional in the art to utilize adjusting closing time of the inlet valve based on an engine speed (See Figure 3, Column 3, lines 27-30) wherein said adjustment is effected by a camshaft phaser (See Figure 1 (92)) coupled to the second camshaft (See Column 5, lines 10-20); a first drive (See Figure 1 (89)) coupled to said first camshaft; and a second drive (See Figure 1 (90)) coupled to said second camshaft.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner on his interpretation of what is shown in Yoshioka. Yoshioka shows, in Figure 1, two camshafts: elements 85 and 86. Camshaft 85 actuates valve 24, which is an intake (or inlet) valve. Camshaft 86 actuates valve 26, which is an exhaust valve. Thus, camshaft 86 does not actuate the inlet valve. Thus, Yoshioka cannot possibly show Applicant's limitations of "a first camshaft for the inlet valve, said first camshaft controlling the opening of the inlet valve; and a second camshaft for the inlet valve, said second camshaft controlling the closing time of the inlet valve." Instead, in the mechanism shown by Yoshioka, camshaft 85 controls both the opening and closing time of the inlet valve and camshaft 86 controls the exhaust valve. Furthermore, in the Yoshioka system, any adjustment of the opening time of the inlet valve, affects the closing time of the inlet valve by the same amount. In Applicant's claim 1, there is "a camshaft phasing mechanism coupled to said second camshaft." Thus, in Applicants' system, an adjustment of the camshaft phasing mechanism affects the second camshaft only and thus only the closing time of the inlet valve is affected.

Because neither Yoshioka or Kreuter, et al. show both first and second camshafts for the inlet valve, as shown in Applicant's claims 1 or 13, the combination, if proper, also does not show both first and second camshafts for the inlet valve, as shown in Applicants' claimed invention. Because the combination of references does not show all of Applicant's limitations, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's rejection

of claims 1 and 13 be withdrawn. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's rejection of claims 2-12 and 14-16, which depend from one of claims 1 and 13, also be withdrawn.

No other art is cited in the Office Action. Based on the foregoing comments, the above-identified application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is courteously solicited. If any further amendment is necessary to advance prosecution and place this case in allowable condition, the Examiner is courteously requested to contact the undersigned by fax or telephone at the number listed below.

Please charge any cost incurred in the filing of this Amendment, along with any other costs, to Deposit Account 06-1510. If there are insufficient funds in this account, please charge the fees to Deposit Account No.06-1505.

Respectfully submitted,

Diana D. Brehob

Diana D. Brehob
Registration No. 51,496
Agent for Applicant

Date: 1/16/2004
Ford Global Technologies, LLC
600 Parklane Towers East
Dearborn, Michigan 48126
(313) 322-1879
Fax: (313) 322-7162